



City of Seattle
Edward B. Murray, Mayor

Department of Planning and Development
D. M. Sugimura, Director

**CITY OF SEATTLE
ANALYSIS AND DECISION OF THE DIRECTOR OF
THE DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT**

Application Number: 3014211
Applicant Name: Mark Wierenga with David Vandervort Architects AIA
Address of Proposal: 722 3rd Avenue North

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED ACTION

Land Use Application to allow three, 3-story residential structures with a total of 16 units. Parking for 16 vehicles to be provided within the structures. Existing structures to be demolished.

The following approvals are required:

Design Review – Seattle Municipal Code (SMC) Chapter 23.41 with the following Development Standard Departures:

1. Front Setback – To allow the front setback to be less than the minimum and average length required. (SMC 23.45.518.A)
2. Projections Permitted into Required Setbacks – To allow horizontal projections (canopies and eaves) to encroach more than the required maximum length. (SMC 23.45.518.H.1)
3. Bay Windows into Setbacks – To allow a bay window width to be more than the maximum required width for bay windows in a required setback. (SMC 23.45.518.H.3)
4. Structure Façade Length – To allow the combined length of all portions of the townhouse structures' facades within 15' of the lot line exceed 65% of the respective lot line. (SMC 23.45.527.B.1)

SEPA - Environmental Determination (SMC Chapter 25.05).

SEPA DETERMINATION:

Determination of Non-significance

- ☐ No mitigating conditions of approval are imposed.
- ☒ Pursuant to SEPA substantive authority provided in SMC 25.06.660, the proposal has been conditioned to mitigate environmental impacts

Site and Vicinity Description

The property topography is relatively level and slopes moderately downward to the south. A concrete retaining wall is located along the northern half of the eastern property line. A large retaining wall is located on the southern property line in the southwestern portion of the site. The parking lot for the neighboring property to the south is approximately 21' lower than the gravel parking lot on the subject site at the base of this wall. The subject site includes identified Environmentally Critical Area (ECA)-Steep Slope. However, based on findings of a geological report, review of the project and site information, a DPD geotechnical reviewer determined that, due to the portion of the project that encroaches upon the ECA will be limited to areas previously developed; no ECA Steep Slope Variance was required. As a result, the applicant has been granted a limited exemption (6338150) for all work associated with this project but ECA submittal, General and Landslide-Hazard Development Standards are still required for the building applications.

A mix of lawn, shrubs and mature trees are located throughout the property. None of the trees have been determined by a qualified tree professional (Lee McMaster, Landscape Architect, P.L.L.C.) as meeting the “Exceptional Tree” designation per Director’s Rule (DR) 16-2008. The DPD Tree Expert has reviewed the Landscape Architect’s written assessment dated October 4, 2013 concurred with these findings.

Surround property west, north and east are also zoned LR3. The property south of the project site is zoned Neighborhood Commercial 3 (NC3-40). Surrounding development includes a mix of townhouse units and apartment buildings east, west and north of the site. A five-story hotel building (Maxwell Hotel) is south of the subject property. The neighborhood is very pedestrian-oriented, and within close proximity to the Seattle Center and amenities of the Lower Queen Anne Uptown neighborhood.

The proposed project is for the design and construction of three, three-story townhouse buildings consisting of a total of sixteen residential units. Parking for sixteen vehicles is proposed within a below-grade parking garage. Access to the basement parking garage is proposed from 3rd Avenue North. The existing residential structures will be demolished.

Grading of approximately 6,086 cubic yards (cu. yds.) of material is anticipated to occur during the removal of material and construction of the structures' basement garage foundation.

Public Comments

Several members of the public attended the Early Design Guidance (EDG) meeting held on June 12, 2013. The following comments, issues and concerns were raised:

- Clarified the height limit for structures constructed on property zoned LR3.
- Inquired about the height of the proposed townhouse building facing Valley Street.
- Observed that, in recent past, the vacant portion of the subject site had been temporarily utilized for onsite construction worker parking associated with several newly constructed developments (Maxwell Hotel, neighboring townhouse developments). Concerned that construction at the subject site will eliminate the construction employee's parking area; and in turn, will negatively impact on-street parking availability in the neighborhood. Questioned where off-street construction parking is planned to be located.
- Concerned that the height of the existing retaining wall near the subject site's south boundary line on the hotel property would negatively affect pedestrian safety in association with the installation of vehicular driveway access stemming from 3rd Avenue North.
- Asked about the width of the driveway entrance versus the wider portion of the driveway.
- Encouraged future design to include exterior materials similar in type and quality that have been used at specific neighboring residential developments (Merrill Gardens, townhouses at the southeast corner of Nob Hill Avenue North).
- Appreciated the proposed design concepts did not include code departures and included below-grade garage parking.
- Encouraged a design that includes widening of the sidewalk and removal of existing angled parking for that portion of the site that abuts 3rd Avenue North.
- Desired fencing/gates leading to the courtyard are transparent-visible to pedestrian views.
- Encouraged a design that allows for a common solid waste/recycling area be located on the property versus individual dumpsters being hauled onto the sidewalks on waste collection days.

Some members of the public attended the Final Recommendation (REC) meeting held on July 30, 2014. The following comments were offered:

- Expressed support of the applicant's requested code departures.
- Appreciated the proposed courtyard design.

The SEPA public comment period for this project ended December 4, 2013. DPD received no written comments from the public during this comment period.

Additional Information

It is anticipated by the applicant that future development activity at the subject site will include the creation of individual units lots (Full Unit Lot Subdivision).

DESIGN REVIEW ANALYSIS

EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE MEETING: June 12, 2013

Three alternative design schemes were presented to the Board. The project team's design development goals were to create a design that compliments the horizontal composition common in the area with prominent vertical elements to provide appropriate scale and rhythm. All three options presented included multiple three-story townhouse buildings equating to approximately sixteen townhouse units above a below-grade sixteen stall parking garage with vehicular access occurring from 3rd Avenue North.

The first scheme (Option 1 “East/West Linear Court”) entailed a townhouse development consisting of two building masses: one eight-unit townhouse building front along Valley Street with residential entries from Valley Street; and, an eight-unit townhouse building directly behind with residential entrances facing a proposed amenity court area between the residential buildings. This scheme showed accessory parking and access located entirely in a below grade structure with each unit having its own garage allowing direct access to the unit.

The second and applicant preferred scheme (Option 2 “T-shaped Court”) included a townhouse development consisting of three building masses: an eight-unit townhouse building fronting along and accessed from Valley Street; and two four-unit townhouse buildings with residential entries accessed from a “t-shaped” amenity court area between the structures. Proposed parking design and access was similar to the first scheme.

The third scheme (Option 3 “Common Garage”) also showed three townhouse building masses: an eight-unit townhouse structure located along and entered from Valley Street; a five-unit townhouse structure located internally to the site and accessed from the “t-shaped” amenity area; and, a three-unit townhouse structure abutting 3rd Avenue North with residential entries from 3rd Avenue North. Parking was located entirely below-grade in a common garage inclusive of a stair access from the garage to the amenity court.

Meeting Materials:

The design packets submitted to the DPD Land Use Planner prior to each Design Review meeting included materials presented at the EDG and Final Recommendation meetings. They are available online by entering the project number (3014211) at this website:
http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/Planning/Design_Review_Program/Project_Reviews/Reports/default.asp
or by contacting the Public Resource Center at DPD:

Mailing Public Resource Center
Address: 700 Fifth Ave., Suite 2000
 P.O. Box 34019
 Seattle, WA 98124-4019

Email: PRC@seattle.gov

PRIORITIES & BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS

After visiting the site, considering the analysis of the site and context provided by the proponents, and hearing public comment, the Design Review Board members provided the following siting and design guidance.

EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE: June 12, 2013

1. **Design Concept and Massing:** The design and siting pattern of the new townhouse residential development should respond to specific site conditions, be oriented to the corner, have entrances visible from the street, be compatible with the anticipated scale of development, and complement the architectural character of neighboring residential buildings.
 - a. The Board debated the merits of all three design schemes and did not state a preference amongst the options presented by the design team. The Board explained that each design concept had elements that combined would be

considered a preferred design scheme. Consequently, the Board did state support for a “hybrid” design to move forward to Master Use Permit (MUP) submittal with following guidance:

- i. The proposal must include some form of residential entrances facing onto 3rd Avenue North, in addition to Valley Street in order to create stronger street presence. (A-3, A-6, A-10, D-2)
 - ii. The proposal must include a wider, more communal amenity court. Additional Board discussion/guidance concerning this subject is offered in item #4. (A-3, A-6, A-7)
 - iii. The proposal should include a stronger presence of building massing oriented more closely to the corner of 3rd Avenue North and Valley Street and the public street fronts. The Board recognized that the subject property’s northernmost property line is set back a larger distance farther from the sidewalk edge along Valley Street (10’) in comparison to the adjacent neighboring property to the east. The Board commented that it would support a future code departure request that, in meeting the intent of this design guidance, would situate the northernmost building (Building 1) closer to Valley Street and the corner, in exchange for a wider centralized internal amenity area. The Board stipulated that the amount of code departure granted must equate to an increase in the internal separation of the proposed townhouse buildings (20’ plus the code departure amount). (A-1, A-7, A-10)
 - b. The Board recognized that the subject property is a zone transition site and advised that future proposals should relate to the surrounding residential properties and not to the neighboring commercial buildings south of the property. The Board stated support of the stepped façade (as best illustrated for Building 1 in Option 3) and the positive direction that the design is headed regarding rhythm, pattern and scale. (B-1, C-2, C-4)
 - c. The Board acknowledged that there is some context for higher quality durable materials in the neighborhood and expect to review physical materials at the Recommendation meeting. (C-4)
 - d. The Board complimented the design team for presenting three viable design concepts for the subject property.
2. **Valley Street Frontage:** The design of the new townhouse residential development should incorporate architectural features, elements and details to achieve a good human scale, provide a positive transition between the townhouse entries to the street, and reinforce the spatial characteristic of Valley Street. (A-1, A-6, C-3)
- a. The Board discussed the merits between protecting an existing mature tree within close proximity to the site’s north property line. The applicant wasn’t certain if the tree (Oregon Ash) was situated within the right-of-way; therefore, making SDOT the decision maker concerning tree removal. The Board did acknowledge that further consultation between the applicant’s landscape architect and the Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) is necessary before the Board could offer any design feedback. Therefore, the Board requested the applicant to address this requirement directly with SDOT during the initial MUP review process and provide SDOT Urban Forester feedback at the Recommendation meeting. (A-1, E-3)

- b. At the Recommendation meeting, the Board expects to review renderings showing how the townhouse buildings, details, landscaping and design relate to the spatial characteristics of the street. Character sketches and/or sections that illustrate design elements (fencing, landscaping, walls, ramps, stairs, and stoops) that would be visible by pedestrians from the sidewalk should also be offered. (A-1, A-6, D-1, E-2)
- 3. **3rd Avenue North Frontage:** The design of the new townhouse residential development should incorporate architectural features, elements and details to enhance pedestrian comfort, discourage blank walls, create entrances visible from the street, and reinforce the existing spatial characteristic of 3rd Avenue North. (A-1, A-3, A-6, D-1, D-2)
 - a. The Board discussed the merits between protecting an existing mature tree within close proximity to the site's west property line. The applicant wasn't certain if the tree (Horse Chestnut) was located within the right-of-way; therefore, making SDOT the decision maker concerning tree removal. Again, the Board requested the applicant to address this requirement directly with SDOT during the initial MUP review process and provide SDOT Urban Forester feedback at the Recommendation meeting. (A-1, E-3)
 - b. Again, the Board expects to review at the Recommendation meeting, renderings showing how the townhouse buildings, details, landscaping and design relate to the spatial characteristics of the street. Character sketches and/or sections that illustrate design elements (fencing, gates, landscaping, walls, ramps, stairs, and stoops/porches) that would be visible by pedestrians from the sidewalk should also be offered. (A-1, A-6, D-1, E-2)
 - c. The Board stated that proposed fencing/gated entry to the courtyard along 3rd Avenue North should allow for visibility to the courtyard amenity area and residential entrances. The treatment of that opening (materiality, visibility, landscaping, security) should be attractive and enhance the pedestrian experience, not create a solid wall/opaque fence barrier against the street. (A-6, C-4, D-1, E-2)
 - d. The Board acknowledged that the blank walls visible from 3rd Avenue North will need to be addressed. The Board expects to review details pertaining to any landscaping and/or design treatments (green screening, etc.) proposed to address this concern at the Recommendation meeting. (D-2, E-2)
- 4. **Residential Open Spaces:** The Board felt that a residential design that includes ground-level and upper level amenity spaces which is usable, attractive, well-integrated, significantly landscaped and allows for greater human connectivity between neighbors is required. (A-7, D-1, E-2)
 - a. The Board felt that the centralized courtyard amenity area should be widened internally and be designed as a semi-public inviting space, welcoming to both residents and visiting guests, and be well landscaped. The Board expects to review access (stairs, ramps, paths) and landscaping elements pertaining to this space at the Recommendation meeting. The Board offered examples of existing residential properties in the vicinity ("Love Israel" at upper Queen Anne (6th Avenue West) and Merrill Gardens) that demonstrate this design successfully. (A-7, D-1, E-2)
 - b. The applicant explained that waste/recycling containers would be situated internally and that future screening of the trash/recycling dumpsters is still being explored. The Board supported a design that screened the trash/recycling in an

attractive manner away from views into the courtyard and away from the pedestrian right-of-way. The Board also stated a program that allows for the trash collector to access waste/recycling removal onsite versus from the sidewalk is preferred. The Board acknowledged further input from Seattle Public Utilities (SPU)-Solid Waste concerning waste/recycling code requirements and from the waste/recycling collection service provider regarding waste/recycling removal practices available to this site is necessary to address this issue. At the Recommendation meeting, the Board expects to review details/feedback from Seattle Public Utilities (SPU)-Solid Waste division and trash collector concerning a trash/recycling solution that addresses the following key elements:

- i. Waste/recycling code requirements;
- ii. Waste/recycling code location;
- iii. Waste/recycling containment (individual containers vs. dumpsters); and
- iv. Waste/recycling screening. (A-7, C-2, D-6)

FINAL RECOMMENDATION MEETING: July 30, 2014

The design massing scheme presented to the Board was based on the preferred scheme (Option 2 “T-shaped Court”) offered at the EDG phase. The preferred massing design had further evolved to encompass information including colors, materials, fenestration, architectural detailing and landscaping.

The building design included three separate residential building masses built above a below-grade parking structure and surrounding an interior courtyard area. The Board identified concerns regarding residential entrances relating to all abutting street fronts, courtyard enhancements, and stronger corner massing presence had been addressed in the proposed design. The entry court had been widened and improved with a mix of private and semi-private functions such as seating, bicycle parking, residential entries and private patio areas. Trash and recycling receptacle storage were presented in both the courtyard (townhouse building #1) and basement private garages (townhouse buildings #2 and #3). Residential open spaces included ground-level common amenity space (courtyard) and private rooftop decks. The presentation included proposed landscaping design details throughout the project development site and within the public realm. Four development standard departures associated with front setback, allowed projections into setback and façade length were presented to the Board.

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS: July 30, 2014

The Board discussed the proposed departures and recommended the departures and conditions, as described, following the Design Review Guidelines section.

1. **Design Concept and Massing:** The design and siting pattern of the new townhouse residential development should respond to specific site conditions, be oriented to the corner, have entrances visible from the street, be compatible with the anticipated scale of development, and complement the architectural character of neighboring residential buildings.
 - a. The Board reviewed the final building design and stated that the design did respond to most of the Board’s guidance offered at the past EDG meeting concerning massing, architectural context, concept and consistency. However, the Board did have outstanding concerns related to the residential street presence abutting 3rd Avenue North and the ground-level courtyard amenity area. Detailed

Board discussion and recommendations concerning this subject are offered in items #3 and #4. (B-1, C-1, C-2)

- b. The Board reviewed the proposed material and color palette and commented that it was responsive to past Board direction. The Board recommended a condition that the future design adhere to the palette offered in the design packet and as presented at the Recommendation meeting. (C-1, C-4)
 - c. At the Recommendation meeting, the Board reviewed a conceptual signage design that identified address signage affixed to the entry canopy above each townhouse units' primary entrance. The Board voiced support for the proposed signage design and noted that additional addressing signage at the two entry points at 3rd Avenue North for development identification (name) and wayfinding purposes to those residential entrances that border the courtyard may be necessary. Further Board discussion and recommendations concerning this subject are offered further in this document. (See 3.b.ii) (A-3, C-2)
2. **Valley Street Frontage:** The design of the new townhouse residential development should incorporate architectural features, elements and details to achieve a good human scale, provide a positive transition between the townhouse entries to the street, and reinforce the spatial characteristic of Valley Street. (A-1, A-6, C-3)
- a. In the Recommendation design packet, the applicant documented confirmation from SDOT that the existing tree (Oregon Ash) discussed at the EDG meeting is situated in the right-of-way: Therefore, SDOT is the decision maker concerning the future tree removal. No further discussion related to this subject was offered by the Board at the Recommendation meeting. (A-1, E-3)
 - b. At the Recommendation meeting, the Board reviewed and discussed the proposed individual bioretention planters abutting the entire valley street front and partially abutting 3rd Avenue North. The Board agreed that the elevated nature of the planters is part of the psychological transition from the private to public realm which is valuable. However, the Board voiced concern that the required controlled structures associated with the bioretention planters will be visible to pedestrians. The Board encouraged the applicant to investigate methods to minimize the visual impact of the controlled structures. (A-1, A-6, D-1, E-2)
3. **3rd Avenue North Frontage:** The design of the new townhouse residential development should incorporate architectural features, elements and details to enhance pedestrian comfort, discourage blank walls, create entrances visible from the street, and reinforce the existing spatial characteristic of 3rd Avenue North. (A-1, A-3, A-6, D-1, D-2)
- a. The applicant's materials included written confirmation that an additional existing mature tree (Horse Chestnut) is located on the subject site's property and the tree is not an "Exceptional Tree" per City standards: Therefore, DPD is the decision maker concerning possible future tree removal. The DPD Tree Expert concurred that the Horse Chestnut tree is not Exceptional. The Board didn't discuss this issue any further at the Recommendation meeting. (A-1, E-3)
 - b. The Board reviewed and discussed the proposed townhouse residential frontage abutting 3rd Avenue North and offered the following feedback and direction:
 - a. The Board members were pleased with the resolution of the transparency and materials applied to residential buildings' west facades (#1 and #2) and proposed ground-level landscaping treatments (plantings and green

screens) at the basement garage entrance and along the site's west perimeter. The Board agreed that these design measures assisted in increasing pedestrian interest. (D-2, E-2)

- b. The Board stated that the proposed two points of entry (stairway and ramp) to the development's interior courtyard from 3rd Avenue North satisfied the intent of the Board guidance regarding visibility of residential entrances/landscaping and establishing a strong street presence. (A-3, A-6, A-10)
 - i. The Board was concerned that the site entry ramp just north of the vehicular driveway did not include any distinctive design elements that signified a residential entrance in character with the design of the stairway entrance. Therefore the Board recommended a condition that the ramp entrance abutting 3rd Avenue North be enhanced with more landscaping treatment and an architectural statement in character with the language proposed for the stairway entrance abutting 3rd Avenue North. Maintaining necessary sight lines from the driveway should be considered. Design options inclusive of a vertical design element, a horizontal element parallel to the sidewalk, widening the entrance to the ramp, pavement differentiation that communicate residential entry were offered by the Board. (A-6, C-4, D-1, E-2)
 - ii. The Board appreciated the arbor element that framed the proposed stairway entrance and commented that the arbor design would add interest and could successfully incorporate a variety of signage-an addressing statement or a more artistic statement. The Board felt that the entrance from the sidewalk edge onto the paved overlook landing needed to be widened to appear more prominent and accommodate design solutions regarding addressing, wayfinding, signage and mailboxes. Therefore, the Board recommended a condition to widen the aperture at the stairway entrance along 3rd Avenue North. (A-6, C-4, D-1)
 - c. The Board reviewed the vehicular garage driveway design which included four bollards separating the concrete driveway from the pedestrian walkway. The Board felt that the proposed bollard design would not create a strong physical barrier to adequately protect residents from vehicles maneuvering to/from the basement parking garage. Therefore, the Board recommended a condition that, in addition to the bollards, a curb or raised sidewalk be incorporated into the driveway design in order to enhance pedestrian safety by creating a strong barrier between the driveway surface and the garage entrance/exit walkway surface. The Board also commented that this condition will aid in decreasing the apparent width of the driveway. (A-8, C-5, D-7)
4. **Residential Open Spaces:** The Board felt that a residential design that includes ground-level and upper level amenity spaces which is usable, attractive, well-integrated, significantly landscaped and allows for greater human connectivity between neighbors is required. (A-7, D-1, E-2)
- a. The Board reviewed the centralized courtyard amenity area and recognized that the area had been enlarged and designed to be a well-landscaped, semi-public/semi-private space for both residents and visiting guests. The Board,

however, noted that the courtyard configuration did not include an area clearly intended for communal gathering and stated that this design concern must be addressed. (See Departures #1, #2 and #4) (A-7, D-1, E-2)

- b. The Board reviewed the conceptual lighting design and recognized that the lighting design included accent lights (uplighting) placed in the raised vegetated tree planters located in the courtyard. The Board voiced concern that the accent lights would negatively impact night sky (light pollution) and should be discouraged. Therefore, the Board recommended a condition that the lighting plan for the site should be revised to no longer include uplighting (tree accent lights) in the courtyard. Instead, exploration of downlight options that would provide pedestrian lighting, as well as, accent lighting for the trees were strongly encouraged by the Board. (A-7, D-1, D-7)
- c. At the Recommendation meeting, the Board questioned the applicant about key details regarding the proposed townhouse units' green roofs and commented that the successful installation of the green roofs would enhance the project. (E-2)
- d. The Board reviewed the materials and details pertaining to the waste/recycling program and appreciated the applicant's response to the Board's request for feedback from SPU. No further concerns related to this subject were voiced by the Board at the Recommendation meeting. (A-7, C-2, D-6)

DESIGN REVIEW GUIDELINES

The Board identified the following Citywide Design Guidelines of highest priority for this project. For the full text please visit the [Design Review website](#).

A. Site Planning

- A-1 **Responding to Site Characteristics.** The siting of buildings should respond to specific site conditions and opportunities such as non-rectangular lots, location on prominent intersections, unusual topography, significant vegetation and views or other natural features.
- A-3 **Entrances Visible from the Street.** Entries should be clearly identifiable and visible from the street.
- A-6 **Transition Between Residence and Street.** For residential projects, the space between the building and the sidewalk should provide security and privacy for residents and encourage social interaction among residents and neighbors.
- A-7 **Residential Open Space.** Residential projects should be sited to maximize opportunities for creating usable, attractive, well-integrated open space.
- A-10 **Corner Lots.** Building on corner lots should be oriented to the corner and public street fronts. Parking and automobile access should be located away from corners.

B. Height, Bulk and Scale

- B-1 **Height, Bulk, and Scale Compatibility.** Projects should be compatible with the scale of development anticipated by the applicable Land Use Policies for the surrounding area and should be sited and designed to provide a sensitive transition to near-by, less intensive zones. Projects on zone edges should be developed in a manner that

creates a step in perceived height, bulk, and scale between anticipated development potential of the adjacent zones.

C. Architectural Elements and Materials

- C-2 Architectural Concept and Consistency.** Building design elements, details and massing should create a well-proportioned and unified building form and exhibit an overall architectural concept. Buildings should exhibit form and features identifying the functions within the building. In general, the roofline or top of the structure should be clearly distinguished from its facade walls.
- C-4 Exterior Finish Materials.** Building exteriors should be constructed of durable and maintainable materials that are attractive even when viewed up close. Materials that have texture, pattern, or lend themselves to a high quality of detailing are encouraged.

D. Pedestrian Environment

- D-1 Pedestrian Open Spaces and Entrances.** Convenient and attractive access to the building's entry should be provided. To ensure comfort and security, paths and entry areas should be sufficiently lighted and entry areas should be protected from the weather. Opportunities for creating lively, pedestrian-oriented open space should be considered.
- D-2 Blank Walls.** Buildings should avoid large blank walls facing the street, especially near sidewalks. Where blank walls are unavoidable they should receive design treatment to increase pedestrian comfort and interest.
- D-6 Screening of Dumpsters, Utilities, and Service Areas.** Building sites should locate service elements like trash dumpsters, loading docks and mechanical equipment away from the street front where possible. When elements such as dumpsters, utility meters, mechanical units and service areas cannot be located away from the street front, they should be situated and screened from view and should not be located in the pedestrian right-of-way.

E. Landscaping

- E-2 Landscaping to Enhance the Building and/or Site.** Landscaping, including living plant material, special pavements, trellises, screen walls, planters, site furniture and similar features should be appropriately incorporated into the design to enhance the project.

DEVELOPMENT STANDARD DEPARTURES

The Board's recommendations on the requested departures were based upon the departure's potential to help the project better meet these design guideline priorities and achieve a better overall design than could be achieved without the departures.

- 1. Front Setback (SMC 23.45.518.A):** The Code states that the required front setback for townhouse developments shall be 7' average and 5' minimum. The applicant proposes that the front setback for townhouse building #1 be allowed to be 4.92' average and 4.2' minimum. The applicant explained that the proposed setback distance would be aligned with the established street frontage along Valley Street.

This departure would result in an overall design that would better meet the intent of Design Review Guidelines A-1, A-2, A-6, A-7 and A-10 by orienting the building massing closer to the corner of 3rd Avenue North and Valley Street and, in turn, allowing the creation of a wider communal amenity court.

The Board acknowledged that this code departure was in response to Board feedback at the EDG meeting and was supportive of the applicant's response to their guidance. However, the Board stated that the interior courtyard, as presented, was not organized in a manner that specified an area dedicated for shared community outdoor space. Therefore, the Board unanimously recommended that DPD grant the requested departure, subject to the following condition:

The interior courtyard for the development should be reconfigured to have an area clearly dedicated for shared community outdoor gathering space.

The Board offered design options such as an outdoor kitchen (barbeque), outdoor furniture (table and chairs), fire pit, water feature, reconfiguration of the planters integrated with seating as methods to achieve the abovementioned condition.

2. **Projections Permitted into Required Setbacks (SMC 23.45.518.H.1):** The Code states that cornices, eaves, gutters, roofs and other forms of weather protection may project into required setbacks and separations a maximum of 4' if they are no closer than 3' to any lot line. The applicant proposes horizontal projections (canopies and eaves) on building #1 measured 2'-6" and not closer than 1'-8" to the northernmost property line abutting Valley Street.

This departure would result in an overall design that would better meet the intent of Design Review Guidelines A-1, A-2, A-7, and A-10 by also siting the building mass closer to the corner and subsequently permitting a more generous amenity courtyard.

The Board stated that this departure is connected with the abovementioned departure for front setback. As a result, the Board unanimously recommended that DPD grant the requested departure subject to the same condition regarding the interior courtyard noted above.

3. **Bay Windows into Setbacks (SMC 23.45.518.H.3):** Per the Code, bay windows and other features that provide floor area may project a maximum of 2' into required setbacks and separations if they are:
 - a. no closer than 5' to any lot line;
 - b. no more than 10' in width; and
 - c. comprise no more than 30% of the area of the façade when combined with garden windows and other features included in subsection 23.45.581.H.2.

The applicant proposes a 13' wide bay window on building #3 which would be situated in the rear setback. The applicant explained that the 13' bay window width is similar to the other bay window on building #3; as well as, the bays for buildings' #1 and #2. Also, the applicant felt that the proposed bay width would create more visual interest to the building's south façade.

This departure would result in an overall design that would better meet the intent of Design Review Guideline C-2 by allowing a bay design that is well-proportioned and maintains architectural consistency throughout the development.

The Board unanimously recommended that DPD grant the requested departure.

4. **Structure Façade Length (SMC 23.45.527.B.1):** The Code requires that, for townhouse structures, the maximum combined length of all portions of facades within 15' of a lot line that is neither a rear lot line nor a street or alley lot line shall not exceed 65% of the length of that lot line. The applicant proposes that the combined length of two structures' east wall facades (buildings #1 and #3) that are within 15' of the east property line be 76% of the side lot line length. The applicant explained that relocating portions of either townhouse buildings farther than 15' away from the east property line would negatively impact the size and quality of the courtyard amenity area. The applicant also mentioned that a re-characterization of the required setbacks, which is allowed for corner lots, was explored for the design scheme.

This departure would result in an overall design that would better meet the intent of Design Review Guidelines A-5, A-7, A-10 and C-2 by allowing unified building forms that are appropriately sited to maximize opportunities for creating a usable and well-integrated common residential amenity space.

The Board stated that this departure is connected with the abovementioned departures for front setback and projections permitted into required setbacks. As a result, the Board unanimously recommended that DPD grant the requested departure subject to the same condition regarding the interior courtyard noted above.

BOARD RECOMMENDATION

The recommendation summarized below was based on the design review packets dated July 30, 2014, and the material shown and verbally described by the applicant at the July 30, 2014 Design Recommendation meeting. After considering the site and context, hearing public comment, reconsidering the previously identified design priorities and reviewing the materials, the five Design Review Board members recommended APPROVAL of the subject design, with the following conditions:

1. The future design should adhere to the palette offered in the design packet and as presented at the Recommendation meeting. (C-1, C-4)
2. The ramp entrance abutting 3rd Avenue North should be enhanced with more landscaping treatment and an architectural statement in character with the language proposed for the stairway entrance abutting 3rd Avenue North. Maintaining necessary sight lines from the driveway should be considered. (A-6, C-4, D-1, E-2)
3. The aperture at the stairway entrance along 3rd Avenue North should be widened to appear more prominent. (A-6, C-4, D-1)
4. A curb or raised sidewalk, in addition to bollards, should be incorporated into the driveway design in order to enhance pedestrian safety by creating a strong barrier between the driveway surface and the garage entrance/exit walkway surface. (A-8, C-5, D-7)

5. The lighting plan for the site should be revised to eliminate uplighting (tree accent lights) in the courtyard in order to mitigate light pollution. Exploration of downlight options that would provide pedestrian lighting, as well as, accent lighting for the trees should be provided instead. (A-7, D-1, D-7)
6. The interior courtyard for the residential development should be reconfigured to include an area clearly dedicated for shared community outdoor gathering space. (A-1, A-2, A-5, A-6, A-7, A-10, C-2)

Subsequent to the July 30, 2014 meeting, the applicant has worked with DPD staff to respond to the Design Review Board Recommended Conditions as follows:

1. The site ramp entrance abutting 3rd Avenue North has been enhanced on applicant's plans to include an arbor element, a landscaped planter and wayfinding signage. This response satisfies recommended condition #2.
2. The applicant's plans illustrate a widened aperture of the main arbor landing at the stairway entrance along 3rd Avenue North. This response satisfies recommended condition #3.
3. The applicant has added a curb, in addition to bollards, to the garage driveway ramp design in response to recommended condition #4. This recommended design review condition has been satisfied.
4. The lighting plans have been modified to no longer include uplighting. This design response, to address recommended condition #5 has been satisfied.
5. The plans have been revised to clearly illustrate a shared gathering space inclusive of integrated seating into the raised planter walls and outdoor furniture all situated in the courtyard. This response satisfies recommended condition #6.

The plans on file reflect the updated design and will be included in the issued MUP plan set.

Subsequent to the July 30, 2014 meeting, the applicant did not address the following Design Review Board Recommended Condition as part of the MUP review:

1. The future design should adhere to the palette offered in the design packet and as presented at the Recommendation meeting. (C-1, C-4)

This condition will be required to be resolved prior to MUP issuance, as conditioned at the end of this document.

ANALYSIS & DECISION – DESIGN REVIEW

The design review process prescribed in Section 23.41.014.F of the Seattle Municipal Code describing the content of the DPD Director's decision reads in part as follows:

The Director's decision shall consider the recommendation of the Design Review Board. Except for projects accepted in the Living Building Pilot Program established in Section 23.40.060, if four or more members of the Design Review Board are in agreement in their recommendation to

the Director, the Director shall issue a decision that makes compliance with the recommendation of the Design Review Board a condition of permit approval, unless the Director concludes that the recommendation of the Design Review Board:

- a. Reflects inconsistent application of the design review guidelines; or*
- b. Exceeds the authority of the Design Review Board; or*
- c. Conflicts with SEPA conditions or other regulatory requirements applicable to the site; or*
- d. Conflicts with the requirements of state or federal law.*

Director's Analysis:

Five members of the West Design Review Board were in attendance and provided recommendations to the Director and identified elements of the Design Guidelines which are critical to the project's overall success. The Director must provide additional analysis of the Board's recommendations and then accept, deny or revise the Board's recommendations (SMC 23.41.014.F.3). The Director agrees with and accepts the conditions recommended by the Board that further augment the selected Guidelines.

Following the Recommendation meeting, DPD staff worked with the applicant to update the submitted plans to include the recommendations of the Design Review Board. The Director of DPD has reviewed the decision and recommendations of the Design Review Board made by the five members present at the decision meeting and finds that they are consistent with the Citywide Design Guidelines. The Director agrees with the Design Review Board's conclusion that the proposed project and conditions imposed result in a design that best meets the intent of the Design Review Guidelines and accepts the recommendations noted by the Board. The Director is satisfied that all of the recommendations imposed by the Design Review Board have been met.

Director's Decision:

The design review process is prescribed in Section 23.41.014 of the Seattle Municipal Code. Subject to the above-proposed conditions, the design of the proposed project was found by the Design Review Board to adequately conform to the applicable Design Guidelines. The Director of DPD has reviewed the decision and recommendations of the Design Review Board made by the five members present at the decision meeting, provided additional review and finds that they are consistent with the City of Seattle Design Review Guidelines. The Design Review Board agreed that the proposed design, along with the condition listed, meets each of the Design Guideline Priorities as previously identified. Therefore, the Director accepts the Design Review Board's recommendations and **CONDITIONALLY APPROVES** the proposed design and four requested departures (Front Setback, Projections Permitted into Require Setbacks, Bay Windows into Setbacks and Structure Façade Length) with the condition summarized at the end of this Decision.

SEPA ANALYSIS

Environmental review resulting in a Threshold Determination is required pursuant to the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), WAC 197-11, and the Seattle SEPA Ordinance (Seattle Municipal Code Chapter 25.05).

The initial disclosure of the potential impacts from this project was made in the environmental checklist submitted by the applicant dated October 3, 2013. The Department of Planning and Development has analyzed and annotated the environmental checklist submitted by the project

applicant; reviewed the project plans and any additional information in the file and any pertinent comments which may have been received regarding this proposed action have been considered.

The SEPA Overview Policy (SMC 25.05.665) clarifies the relationship between the City's codes, policies and environmental review. Specific policies for each element of the environment, and certain neighborhood plans and other policies explicitly referenced, may serve as the basis for exercising substantive SEPA authority. The Overview Policy states, in part: *"Where City regulations have been adopted to address an environmental impact, it shall be presumed that such regulations are adequate to achieve sufficient mitigation"* subject to some limitations.

Codes and development regulations applicable to this proposed project will provide sufficient mitigation for most short and/or long term impacts. Applicable codes may include the Stormwater Code (SMC 22.800-808), the Grading Code (SMC 22.170), the Street Use Ordinance (SMC Title 15), the Seattle Building Code, and the Noise Control Ordinance (SMC 25.08). Puget Sound Clean Air Agency regulations require control of fugitive dust to protect air quality. Additional discussion of short and long term impacts is found below.

Short – term Impacts

The following temporary or construction-related impacts are expected: temporary soil erosion; decreased air quality due to increased dust and other suspended air particulates during demolition, excavation, filling and transport of materials to and from the site; increased noise and vibration from construction operations and equipment; increased traffic and parking demand from construction personnel traveling to and from the work site; consumption of renewable and non-renewable resources; disruption of utilities serving the area; and conflict with normal pedestrian movement adjacent to the site. Compliance with applicable codes and ordinances will reduce or eliminate most adverse short-term impacts to the environment.

Noise

The site abuts two streets (Valley Street and 3rd Avenue North). Residential properties are situated east, north and west of the project site; and are located in the same zone (LR3). A hotel development, zoned NC3-40, is located south of the site. The hotel mechanical equipment and vehicular traffic are identified as existing noise sources. The applicant asserts on the SEPA checklist that construction activity will be confined to construction hours permitted within City of Seattle and usage of generators will be limited onsite. The applicant further specified the estimated construction hours as follows: 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m., Monday thru Friday; and 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on Saturday.

Short-term noise and vibration from construction equipment and construction activity (e.g., backhoes, trucks, concrete mixers, generators, pneumatic hand tools, engine noise, back-up alarms, etc.); and construction vehicles entering and exiting the site would occur as a result of construction and construction-related traffic. Compliance with the Noise Ordinance (SMC 25.08) is required.

The Noise Ordinance states construction activities within 100' of occupied Lowrise and Neighborhood Commercial zones shall be limited to non-legal holiday weekdays from 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. and 9:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. on weekends and legal holidays. Impact construction work (pile driving, jackhammers, vibrator trucks, etc.) is further limited (8:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m. weekdays and 9:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m. weekends and legal holidays). It is the Department's conclusion that limiting hours of construction beyond the requirements of the Noise Ordinance is

not justified for this project on this specific site. No further conditioning or mitigation is warranted.

Air Quality

Demolition of the existing structures, grading and construction activities will result in localized short-term increases in air particulates and carbon monoxide which could temporarily affect the air quality in the vicinity. Demolition/construction activities that would contribute to these impacts include excavation, grading, soil compaction, and operation of heavy trucks and smaller equipment (i.e., generators and compressors). Compliance with the Street Use Ordinance (SMC 15.22.060) will require the contractors to water the site or use other dust palliative, as necessary, to reduce airborne dust. In addition, compliance with the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency regulations requires activities which produce airborne materials or other pollutant elements to be contained with temporary enclosure. Regarding asbestos, Federal Law requires the filing of a Notice of Construction with the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency ("PSCAA") prior to demolition. Other potential sources of dust would be soil blowing from uncovered dump trucks and soil carried out of the construction area by vehicle frames and tires; this soil could be deposited on adjacent streets and become airborne.

There is no indication of unusual short term adverse impacts related to air quality. Current codes are adequate to provide mitigation and pursuant to the Overview Policy (SMC Section 25.05.665) and Air Quality Policy (SMC Section 25.05.675A). Therefore, no further mitigation is warranted.

Earth

Excavation of soil will be necessary to establish desired grades to allow for the structures' foundation at this ECA designated (Steep Slope) property. The maximum amount of grading proposed will consist of 6,086 cu. yds. of material. All of the onsite soil will be handled per a geotechnical engineer's recommendations.

The ECA Ordinance and Director's Rule (DR) 18-2011 require submission of a soils report to evaluate the site conditions and provide recommendations for safe construction/grading in potentially steep slope soil areas. Pursuant to this requirement the applicant submitted a geotechnical engineering report dated November 19, 2012 prepared by Jason L. Hinds, geotechnical engineer and D. Robert Ward, P.E.; and a supplemental exploration report dated January 20, 2014 prepared by Thor Christensen, P.E. and D. Robert Ward, P.E. (Geotech Consultants, Inc.). This report and addendum evaluated soil and site conditions and provided recommendations for general earthwork, erosion and drainage controls, grading, earthwork and foundation/retaining wall construction.

The geotechnical reports have been reviewed by DPD's geotechnical experts who determined that the impacts to soils can be sufficiently mitigated through the Grading Code and Stormwater Code review by the Geotechnical Engineer during the Building Permit phase of review. The applicant will be required to submit geotechnical studies and any other information to determine compliance with those Codes during Building Permit review. No additional mitigation is warranted pursuant to SEPA policies.

Construction-Related Streets Parking and Pedestrian Circulation

The proposal includes demolition of existing structures and grading of approximately 6,086 cu. yds. of material. This material would be trucked from the site. The applicant explains that construction vehicles would enter and exit the project site from a temporary construction

entrances situated at the north side of the site via Valley Street and the west side of the site via 3rd Avenue North (referenced as the “south entrance”). Construction activities may necessitate occasional closures of adjacent roadways and sidewalks. Alternatives which allow for this pedestrian route to be kept open to the greatest extent possible have been considered. The applicant states the following information regarding staging and sidewalk closures, “...*most heavy equipment for the project will be limited to use on-site....After foundation, we will have two primary staging areas: One on-site at the south construction entrance. This will be used for supply of construction material for buildings 2 and 3. The second staging area will be in the Valley street R/W along the north side of the site. This will be used for supply of construction material for building 1. The Valley street R/W is very wide at this location, and there is a large distance between the sidewalk and the property line (more than 13'). This will allow the contractor to set up a temporary job shack at this location and to stage materials and small equipment above the project while maintaining the existing sidewalk for pedestrian safety. R/W permits will be obtained from the contractor for all work in the R/W. There will be times when the sidewalk will need to be closed and sometimes when parking will be closed along Valley, and possibly along 3rd Ave for short times in order to gain access to the site for construction, or supplying materials to the site.*”

Construction of the project is proposed to last for several months. The applicant estimates that a maximum of 16 construction workers will be onsite throughout the construction process. The applicant indicates construction workers will park onsite until demolition is complete. Once excavation is underway, construction workers will utilize “*long-term parking some distance from the project, or the parking garage located off of Roy Street [Seattle Center Mercer Parking Garage]. General construction workers and laborers will be required to either ride-share with their foremen, use transit, park some distance from the site, or park in the local parking garage.*” The amount of on-street parking available to construction workers appears limited due to time restrictions on several of the nearby block fronts. The demand for parking by construction workers during construction is anticipated to further reduce the supply of parking in the vicinity.

Increased trip generation is expected during the proposed demolition, grading, and construction activity. The immediate area is subject to traffic congestion during the peak hours on nearby arterials in association with special events at the Seattle Center and construction activity in the South Lake Union area along the Mercer Corridor. Large trucks turning from and onto nearby arterial streets would be expected to further exacerbate the flow of traffic. There are no City codes or ordinances to address the impact of large vehicles on highly congested streets. As a result, mitigation is warranted as described below.

It is the City's policy to minimize or prevent adverse traffic impacts which would undermine the stability, safety, and/or character of a neighborhood or surrounding areas (25.05.675 R). The Street Use Ordinance includes regulations which mitigate dust, mud, and circulation. Any temporary closure of the sidewalk and/or traffic lane(s) is adequately controlled with a street use permit through the Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT). Due to construction related demand affected by construction worker parking and increased trip generation; additional mitigation is warranted pursuant to the Construction Impacts Policy (SMC 25.05.675.B). Pursuant to this policy, a Construction Management Plan (CMP) addressing construction worker parking, street/sidewalk closures, truck haul routes and hours of truck traffic, will be required to mitigate identified impacts. This plan should include elements that will reduce construction worker parking demand on surrounding streets and a requirement that truck trips be scheduled to

avoid peak periods of 4:00-6:00 p.m., Monday through Friday. The approved plan will be required prior to the issuance of any future demolition, grading and/or building permit.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Construction activities including construction worker commutes, truck trips, the operation of construction equipment and machinery, and the manufacturing of the construction materials themselves result in increases in carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emissions which adversely impact air quality and contribute to climate change and global warming. While these impacts are adverse, they are not expected to be significant due to the relatively minor contribution of greenhouse gas emissions from the project.

No further conditioning or mitigation is warranted pursuant to specific environmental policies or the SEPA Overview Policy (SMC 25.05.665).

Long - term Impacts

Long term or use-related impacts are also anticipated as a result of this proposal, including: increased bulk and scale on the site; increased ambient noise associated with increased human activity and vehicular movement; increased traffic in the area and increased demand for parking; increased demand for public services and utilities; increased airborne emissions resulting from additional traffic; increased energy consumption; and increased light and glare. Compliance with applicable codes and ordinances will reduce or eliminate most adverse long-term impacts to the environment.

Historic Preservation

Section 25.05.675.H of the SEPA code describes the City's policies for protecting historical sites. *"It is the City's policy to maintain and preserve significant historic sites and structures and to provide opportunity for analysis of archeological sites.....For projects involving structures or sites which are not yet designated as historical landmarks but which appear to meet the criteria for designation, the decisionmaker or any interested person may refer the site or structure to the Landmarks Preservation Board for consideration.....On sites with potential archaeological significance, the decisionmaker may require an assessment of the archaeological potential of the site."*

SEPA provides authority to mitigate impacts to historic buildings (SMC 25.05.675.H.2.c). In this instance, the existing single family residence and apartment building located at 722 3rd Avenue North are not designated as historical landmarks. However, because this proposal involves the demolition of two buildings which are more than 50 years old, historical information concerning these properties (prepared by the applicant) was referred to the Department of Neighborhoods (DON) for review. The DON Historic Preservation Staff reviewed the information and stated, "Based on the review of this information, as well as information from the City's Historic Resources Survey database, we have determined that it is unlikely that the subject buildings would meet the standards for designation as an individual landmark." Therefore, no further conditioning is warranted by SEPA.

Parking

The proposal site is situated within a multifamily zone (LR3) and a frequent transit service corridor. Parking is required for this residential project per the Land Use Code (SMC 23.54). The submitted MUP plans indicate sixteen parking spaces will be provided onsite.

Based on current City experience with multifamily housing demand, it is expected that this project will generate a residential parking demand of approximately one space per unit. Using this multiplier, the estimated parking demand for sixteen townhouse units would be sixteen parking spaces. As a result of this calculation, no spillover parking is expected on the surrounding street system. Therefore, no mitigation of parking impacts is necessary pursuant to SEPA.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Operational activities, primarily vehicular trips associated with the project and the project's energy consumption, are expected to result in increases in carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emissions which adversely impact air quality and contribute to climate change and global warming. While these impacts are adverse, they are not expected to be significant due to the relatively minor contribution of greenhouse gas emissions from this project.

No further conditioning or mitigation is warranted pursuant to specific environmental policies or the SEPA Overview Policy (SMC 25.05.665).

DECISION - SEPA

This decision was made after review by the responsible official on behalf of the lead agency of a completed environmental checklist and other information on file with the responsible department. This constitutes the Threshold Determination and form. The intent of this declaration is to satisfy the requirement of the State Environmental Policy Act (RCW 43.21.C), including the requirement to inform the public of agency decisions pursuant to SEPA.

[X] Determination of Non-Significance. This proposal has been determined to not have a significant adverse impact upon the environment. An EIS is not required under RCW 43.21C.030(2)(C).

[] Determination of Significance. This proposal has or may have a significant adverse impact upon the environment. An EIS is required under RCW 43.21C.030(2)(C).

SEPA CONDITIONS

Prior to Issuance of Any Demolition, Grading and Building Permit:

1. In order to address construction related transportation and parking impacts, the responsible party shall submit a Construction Management Plan (CMP) to be reviewed and approved by Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) in consultation with DPD. A construction transportation plan for workers and truck deliveries/routes shall be prepared to minimize disruption to traffic flow on adjacent streets and roadways. This plan shall include a requirement that truck trips be scheduled to avoid the peak period of 4:00-6:00 p.m., Monday through Friday. The plan shall consider the need for special signage; flaggers; haul route definitions; street cleaning; identification of potential street and/or sidewalk closures; vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian circulation and safety; and identification of construction-worker parking. This plan should include elements that will reduce construction worker parking demand on surrounding streets. **P**

During Construction

2. The owner(s) and/or responsible party(s) shall comply with the Construction Management Plan. A copy of that plan must be kept onsite. **I**

DESIGN REVIEW CONDITIONS

Prior to Issuance of the Master Use Permit (MUP)

3. Modify the Master Use Permit (MUP) plans to include materials and colors that adhere to the palette offered in the design packet and as presented to the Design Review Board at the Recommendation meeting in response to the Design Review Board Recommended Condition #1.

During Construction

4. Any changes to the design, building exterior or landscape plan shall be submitted to DPD for review and approval.

Prior to Certificate of Occupancy

5. The Land Use Planner shall inspect materials, colors, and design of the constructed project. All items shall be constructed and finished as shown in the Master Use Plan (MUP) set. Any change to the proposed design, materials, or colors shall require prior approval by the Land Use Planner (Tami Garrett 206-233-7182 or tami.garrett@seattle.gov).
6. The applicant shall provide a landscape certificate from Director's Rule 10-2011, indicating that all vegetation has been installed per approved landscape plans. Any change to the landscape plans approved with this Master Use Permit shall be approved by the Land Use Planner (Tami Garrett 206-233-7182 or tami.garrett@seattle.gov).

For the Life of the Project

7. The building and landscape design shall be substantially consistent with the materials represented at the Recommendation meeting and in the materials submitted after the Recommendation meeting, before the MUP issuance. Any change to the proposed design, including materials or colors, shall require prior approval by the Land Use Planner (Tami Garrett 206-233-7182 or tami.garrett@seattle.gov).

Signature: (signature on file) Date: November 13, 2014
Tami Garrett, Senior Land Use Planner
Department of Planning and Development